

U.S. GOVERNMENT
LIBRARY
OF AGRICULTURE

Land policy REVIEW

APR 18 1942

Contents FOR APRIL 1942

Vol. V No. 4

Page

Production Now!	<i>Frederick B. Sweet</i>	3
Idle Manpower . <i>Philip G. Hammer</i> and <i>Robert K. Buck</i>		9
Crop Insurance	<i>Leroy K. Smith</i>	19
The Post-War High Plains . . .	<i>Karl S. Landstrom</i>	21
Aims for Farm Labor	<i>A Committee</i>	25
State Legislation	<i>Arthur B. Jebens</i>	33
Community Mobilization. . . .	<i>Douglas Ensminger</i>	36
Economic Research	<i>David L. MacFarlane</i>	37
Changes on the Plains	<i>Gordon Murray</i>	40
Books		41

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS



Editorial Notes

CONTRIBUTORS: FRED SWEET is a young former editor of an Ohio weekly newspaper. He came to Washington last November to help in the war effort, started wondering about how individual farmers could boost production, and went back to Ohio to inaugurate the widely-publicized *Production Now!* movement.

DAVID L. MACFARLANE, assistant professor of farm economics in the University of Kentucky, Lexington, writes: "While my paper may appear to be that of a purist, it is really that of an eclectic. The writer's eclectic character is demonstrated by his wish to see published in *Land Policy Review* this paper which advances a line of thought not often evidenced in that worthy periodical."

PHILIP G. HAMMER and **ROBERT K. BUCK** are members of the program planning and analysis division of Farm Security Administration.

LEROY K. SMITH is manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

KARL S. LANDSTROM is acting regional research supervisor, BAE division of land economics, Amarillo.

The Committee that wrote the report on *A War Program for County Farm Labor Committees* comprised five men working in Amarillo: **EARL BELL** of BAE, **F. A. WELLS** of The United States Employment Service, **CLIFFORD DAVIS** of WPA, **CLAY COCHRAN** of FSA, and **DAN BOYD** of SMA.

DOUGLAS ENSMINGER is a senior social scientist in charge of the work of community organization, division of farm population and rural welfare, BAE.

WILBUR H. YOUNGMAN, whose work in BAE involves outlook reports and extension, is well known as a writer on gardening and judge of flower and garden shows.

GORDON MURRAY, an economist in the BAE division of farm economics, does research work in farm tenancy.

ARTHUR O. SHAPIRO is a young economist in the Office of Emergency Management.

ARTHUR B. JEBENS' article in this number is the second in his series about State legislation.

LA

Land
Econ
the Bu
Printi

P

By F
a pla
it ha
fire a
what



Board
"W
war n
in e
farm
"I
now
On
noon-
day—
met i
Gilea
vote
muni
dome
slogar
ing th
and t
began

LAND

LAND • POLICY • REVIEW

Land Policy Review is published monthly by the Bureau of Agriculture Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, with approval of the Bureau of the Budget. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 5 cents a single copy, 50 cents a year

Production Now! TO WIN THE WAR

By FREDERICK B. SWEET. *The suddenly famous author of a plan for a community pull-together to produce now tells how it happened that the citizens of Morrow County, Ohio, caught fire at the idea of getting something done themselves, and just what it was that they did.*



ON SATURDAY, February 28, the President wrote to the Chairman of the War Production

Board:

"We are all belligerents. This war must be fought in every factory, in every home, and on every farm . . .

"I direct you to raise production now . . ."

On the preceding Sunday afternoon—it was Washington's Birthday—the people of Morrow county met in the Opera House in Mount Gilead, Ohio, and decided by voice vote to mobilize their entire community for guerilla warfare on the domestic front under the militant slogan, "Production, Now!" Pledging the use of every technique, tool, and talent at their command, they began a pattern of people's partici-

pation in the war which is already being adapted to the needs of scores of widely separated places.

Why did the plain citizens of Morrow county, and the President of the United States get the same idea almost at the same moment? The answer is an easy one: since Pearl Harbor millions of United States minds have had hammered home to them the fact that not by the draft and defense bonds alone can this war be won for our side. For the fruitful fields, the ingenious factory systems of America have a special role to play in the task of the United Nations. And those fields and those factories are useless without the understanding work of the people themselves.

The Production, Now! idea—the Morrow County Plan—is as simple, direct, and audacious an answer to

Fascist treachery as any of the startlingly successful direct tactics which have been pursued by the Axis.

It is simple because it is a natural outgrowth of community life and is within the experience framework of everyone. It is direct because it bypasses red tape to get the production job done at the only place where it can be done—at the bench, in the barnyard. It is audacious because it is the obvious solution to a problem which might easily grow so complex as to be ponderously impossible to solve.

It is readily adaptable to any community of people who wholly and wholeheartedly want to get this war won as quickly as possible. That community can be a county, a town, a neighborhood, a plant, an industry, a city, a State—or the entire Nation.

It holds the logical answer to the universal question: "What can I do to help win this war?"

A People's War

It is predicated upon a few important facts-of-World-War-II:

First, this is a people's war in the fullest, deepest meaning of the phrase.

Second, there is a virulent plague abroad in the world, the insidious, creeping paralysis called Too Little, Too Late. *And its victims to date have been on our side.*

Third, among the United Nations, ours must supply not only men to share physically the destruction of the Fascist power, but an enormous proportion of the weapons, the food, and the fiber.

Beginning with these facts about this war, Production, Now! lays down the following basis for action in the preamble to the proposal out

of which grew the events in Morrow county.

Production, Now! "is advanced as a practical program for creating the broadest possible popular base of participation in the job of war production. Without the enthusiastic and knowledgeable support of the people themselves, that job cannot be geared to its highest potential. And that kind of support is not possible without participation by everybody concerned.

"It is a matter of first importance that the American people bear constantly in mind the purpose of this unsought struggle: To rid the earth of a philosophy opposed to the interests of the plain people of all lands. A corollary to that purpose is the common character of the struggle among the peoples of all lands, and the responsibility for success in the struggle among the people of America itself. Unless it be made unmistakably clear that this is a people's war, that the people themselves understand it as such, and that it can be won only by the fighting and working of the people themselves, then there is grave danger that it will be followed by a peace which is not a people's peace. . . .

"There can be no doubt that there remains to be released the vast energy, creative enthusiasm and productive genius of the grassroots—of the little people of America. The plan presented here is meant to tap the eagerness of all America to share each in his own way, the task at hand: Winning a war.

"It is a plan for communitywide mobilization for war production. It proposes a new pattern for action to meet a new situation. It requires the formation of a communitywide

base among workers, farmers, housewives, little businessmen. It calls for leadership capable of understanding plain people and the part they must play."

On Wednesday night, February 18, in the basement of the courthouse in Mount Gilead, about 80 people came together to hear the proposal concerning *Production, Now!* There were members of the county's only trade union; there were Grangers and Farm Bureau members; there were American Legionnaires and Daughters of the American Revolution; there were preachers, teachers, Federal agency representatives, county and township officials; there were men from the management side of the county's only industry; there were a large number of women and a number of young people.

Up Rose a Farmer

Production, Now! was explained. Then the group was told, in substance: "There it is. If you think it can be made to work in Morrow county, it's yours to do with as you please."

The people of Morrow county lost no time. There was spontaneous response from the floor:

Up rose a farmer from Washington township: "Up on our place this year we'll grow spuds enough to feed 10,000 soldiers for a year, at three bushels per man. But we've got to get spray materials, and labor, or we can't deliver the goods. This *Production, Now!* idea sounds like a good way to get the whole county busy breaking bottlenecks."

President of the union local: "Our guys, some of them, are driving 25 and 30 miles to work. We're going to be running out of tires. Maybe

this *Production, Now!* will be what we need to get the whole county helping us work out a car-pooling plan, or some bus lines, so we can get to work to build the presses that have got to build the bombers that have got to relieve MacArthur."

A vocational agriculture teacher: "We've got about three times as much machine power on our farms in this county as we'd need if it was all used efficiently. This year we're going to be short of hands. We'll have to make those machines do more work. Looks like *Production, Now!* is what we need to take a census of the tractors, combines, cornpickers, and such. We could spot them on a big county map, and a man in Washington township wouldn't have to chase all the way to South Bloomfield to get his beans out, if he found there was a combine for hire right down the road."

A housewife: "Why not get the papers to print low-cost menus worked out by different ladies in the county, so our men and children can get the most strength at the least cost? And why couldn't the women who live in town go out and help farm wives with the housework while the farm women are helping out in the fields? And is there any reason why we women couldn't catalogue all the available rooms for refugees in the county in case of bombing attacks on the coasts?"

And so it went. Out of their own concern over the dreadful fact of war, the people of that place had been searching for ways to help, facing problems that could be solved right there where they live. *Production, Now!* offered a chance for them to put their own ideas to work in their own way.

A dozen or more additional sug-

gestions which an entire community could tackle together, each too big a job for one person to do by himself, were put forward. Among them:

A "sugar bank," filled by contributions of an ounce or two a week from many families, to be used for canning surplus fruit, picked by children to eke out next year's school lunch program.

Modern Minute Men

A crew of farming "minute men" who will drop their townsmen's tasks to answer hurry calls from farmers in need of a crew for a day to get in his hay, or shock his oats.

Communitywide support of the county's only factory in its search for skilled men.

Ideas flowed so freely, and enthusiasm ran so high, that the group decided to call a Sunday afternoon mass meeting in the Mount Gilead Opera House. Preachers announced it from their pulpits; a nearby radio station contributed spot announcements; school principals broadcast it to pupils; a "Paul Revere" crew of women manned telephones and summoned farmers; the REA mailing list was used to send letters to rural families.

A committee selected Wednesday night, and including representatives of labor, farm groups, churches, management, little business, youth, fraternal bodies, schools, local officials met on Friday, nominated a slate of permanent officers for the Production, Now! Committee, arranged an agenda, plotted several specific projects on which work could be undertaken Monday morning.

On strips of wallpaper, high school

girls painted slogans and signs, with which the Opera House was festooned. Local 1319 of the Machinists union—the county's only labor union, which in this enterprise was for the first time accepted as part of the community—held a meeting on Saturday night to talk over what they could do to help. The Columbus newspapers began to show an interest in what was going on in Mount Gilead. A photographer appeared to take pictures of the people mobilizing for war.

Sunday was Washington's Birthday. About 600 people turned out for the meeting. The high school band played. A Methodist clergyman invoked God's blessing on the proceedings. The plan was explained to the audience by its author. Then, just as the chairman was preparing to read the nominees and call for nominations from the floor, objection was made that the mass meeting was ignoring the formal channels of action. But almost as one man, the people refused to accept this argument.

Farmers, preachers, a village poet, draft board members, workers, young people, housewives, businessmen. All said: Let's do the job ourselves.

A vote was taken. One vote was cast against Production, Now! and the meeting proceeded to the election of officers.

There were a few speeches, some projects were suggested, the meeting broke up. The next day, the Civilian Defense Councils of villages and towns decided to ask the Production, Now! Committee to channel their suggestions and plans through the officially established agencies in the county. It was agreed that such a course was entirely satisfactory.

All

Just as we fight for economic rights and for justice for the individual, so we must fight for the conservation and preservation of our great natural resources, the soil, the forest, the lake and the stream, which are the birthright of all the people.

—LOUIS J. TABER

In Morrow county, Ohio, a visitor will now see a county operating on an all-out war basis.

At the center of the stage is the Production, Now! Committee under F. O. VanSickle, retired Cardington farmer, as chairman; and H. S. Kirkpatrick, insurance man and farmer, and the union's choice for the post, as vice chairman. These two men, with an advisory committee representing all elements in the county, are performing two extraordinarily useful functions:

They are busy finding problems to be solved, calling meetings to figure out ways of solving them, and asking that the local agencies—employment service, highway department, township trustees, Defense Councils, Farm War Board and other established official groups—do something definite to meet these problems.

They are a publicly established means of affording the people themselves a means for making their wants effectively known, and for needling the official agencies into

action in ways that will meet the needs of a people trying to win a war.

Under the aegis of the Production, Now! Committee, but working through officially established agencies, the following things are now under way:

1. A periodic scrap collection schedule for metal, rags, rubber, paper. Collections are being made by county and township trucks (they can get tires!).

2. A spare parts pool has been established, to be filled by usable machinery parts from farm junk piles. These parts will be gleaned from the cargoes brought in by the scrap collection drivers.

3. A farm labor survey is in progress, and it's being made by farmers in this way: Five farmers in each of 16 townships are estimating their own labor needs for this season, and of the next four farms down the road. Thus, a sampling of 400 out of the county's 2,700 farms will be taken on which to base estimates for the county. When the labor requirements are thus established, a request will be made through the State employment service for manpower. If the State can't supply it, the farming "minute men" will be used, and school authorities have already been asked to release older boys for work in the late spring and early fall.

4. Women in the county are registering women workers who are ready to go into farm homes to do housework while farmers' wives work with their men in the fields.

5. Under the vocational agriculture teachers, the Future Farmers of America are making a machinery census, will spot tractors, combines, all labor-saving equipment on a

county map. They are also establishing a uniform scale of prices for the rental or custom use of such equipment, after consultation with owners willing to permit its use on this community base.

6. The Machinists' local has launched a voluntary bond buying program, under which workers may have certain sums deducted from their paychecks, the money to be used for defense stamps and bonds.

7. The local has instituted a study of its transportation problem, and is working with the State utilities commission on possible bus lines, with school bus operators to determine the feasibility of a before-and-after school method of transportation in school vehicles, and among its own members on a car-pooling plan.

8. The local has organized a special production committee to sit down with management and work out answers to production problems, a proposal strongly endorsed by Donald Nelson as one way to heighten industrial production.

These things are all being done, right now, as you read these words. These projects were started right away after the Opera House meeting. In addition, other things are going on in Morrow county:

A countywide gardening program, with groups of women learning how to preserve foods in new ways, by drying and winter storage and the like, is about to be launched by the county agent and the AAA.

Our farmers have never failed the country and I don't think they ever will.

—CLAUDE R. WICKARD

Amateurs are being encouraged to keep bees to help make up for the sugar rationing.

A Consumer Information Center is planned in which town and farm women will take part.

Meetings in townships and schools and the county seat will be held to report on the community's progress in doing its part to win the war.

The Mount Gilead village council held a special meeting, sold the rails of an abandoned spur on its municipally owned Short Line for scrap.

The defense council is registering everybody in the county who wants to volunteer, classifying their skills for easy reference.

A group of women is planning a central talent index, so that community meetings—which will grow more important as tires grow scarcer—won't lack for fiddlers, tap dancers, singers, and the like.

Morrow county, in other words, has gone to work to use the things it has at hand to win the war and make life at home as tolerable as possible under the rapidly increasing strictures of a world at war.

Morrow county has put forward a militant people's slogan, Production Now! Tired of the headlines telling of defeats, impatient with the headlines proclaiming victories-to-come, production-to-come, the people of that place have answered for themselves the question, "What can I do to help?"

Any other community can do the same. Only remember this: the people themselves have what it takes to win this war. The farmers, the workers—the little people of America—have the courage, the resourcefulness and the leadership to put this plan across, and it can't be done without them.

Wasted Manpower

IN AGRICULTURE

By PHILIP G. HAMMER and ROBERT K. BUCK. *"It is possible that some thinkers will regard the situation as a natural: Shift the idle farmers from their farms to those that need labor and the problem is solved. But it is not so simple as that."*



FACED WITH the greatest demands ever made upon it, United States agriculture is finding itself in the middle of a strange paradox. On the one hand, acute farm labor shortages are developing in many areas with very severe ones in prospect for the future. On the other, there is on the Nation's farms a gigantic reservoir of untapped man-power represented by thousands of small, low-income farmers who do not have enough productive work to do.

It is possible that some thinkers will regard the situation as a natural: Shift the idle farmers from their farms to those that need labor and the problem is solved. But it is not so simple as that. The fact is that most of the idle farmers are not farm laborers at all; they are bona fide farm operators running bona fide, if somewhat small, farms. And it is becoming increasingly clear that the full utilization of their labor *right where they are* is essential if the Nation's war food production goals are going to be reached at all.

The farm labor shortage is serious, of course. Shifts of idle man-power to productive farms needing labor are vitally important. But,

without meaning to underrate the importance of that problem, it is the purpose of this article to focus attention upon the problems and vast potentialities of the under-employed farm operator who needs work to do rather than the short-handed larger operator who needs labor on his farm. In our anxiety about the latter, we must not forget that the army of small, under-employed farm families might hold the key to this Nation's war food production worries.

The case for the low-income farmer in the war effort has already been presented by James Maddox in a prepared statement before the Select Committee to Investigate National Defense Migration, of the House of Representatives. Also before members of Congress, Howard R. Tolley and John D. Black have lent emphatic approval to the same theme: The small farmer, the low-income farmer, has idle man-power which must be mobilized in the war food production program.

Maddox maintained that there are about 2,194,000 farmers in the United States whose labor, for one reason or another, is only partially utilized. He pointed out that these farmers—operators with gross

earned farm incomes of less than \$800 a year—could, if given the proper opportunities, produce a substantial portion of the war food increases called for by the Department.

We believe that Mr. Maddox was too conservative in his estimates. It will be advanced in this article:

(1) That there are at least 2,717,000 low-income farmers, 56 percent of all bona fide farmers in the country, whose labor is only partly utilized now.

(2) That this group of farmers is capable of producing an even more substantial part of the Nation's increased food needs than Mr. Maddox figured.

(3) That a production program such as Maddox, Tolley, and Black suggested for utilizing the idle manpower of these low-income farmers is immediately practicable.

Let us first determine roughly the amount of idle man-power on the Nation's farms.

The 1940 Census furnishes excellent evidence on the extent of under-employment on farms, since every farm was classified according to the value of farm products sold, traded, or used at home.

It was Mr. Maddox's thesis that farms with gross earned farm income of below \$800 a year do not have sufficient production to furnish full employment for a family. We believe that the \$800 figure is too low. Among the hundreds of thousands of farms with total farm production valued at \$1,000 or even \$1,500, the family labor is not fully employed. We propose the \$1,000 figure as the amount of gross income in 1939 necessary to furnish full employment to a farm family.

It can be demonstrated that farmers producing less than \$1,000 gross earned farm income are under-employed. The typical farmer in this group produces about \$600 worth of farm products. In the Midwest this income could be obtained from 2 milk cows, 20 pigs, 50 hens, and a garden, as follows:

2 cows producing 170 lbs. butter-fat @ \$0.30.....	\$101
2 calves vealed @ \$15.00.....	30
20 pigs averaging 200 lbs. @ \$0.09.....	360
50 hens producing 7 doz. eggs @ \$0.25.....	87
A garden.....	40

Total production..... 618

Obviously, caring for these livestock and the small acreages of crops necessary to feed them in no way approximates full employment for the typical low-income Midwest farm family.

The same story of under-employment can be told for the hundreds of thousands of farmers in the South who in 1939 (the year covered by the 1940 Census) averaged a production of farm products sold, traded, or used at home totaling only \$600. This volume of production could come from eight acres of cotton, two pigs, and a garden as follows:

8 acres of cotton—370 lbs. lint per acre @ 15¢.....	\$444
700 lbs. seed per acre @ 10¢.....	70
2 pigs, averaging 175 lbs. pork @ 9¢.....	31
25 hens averaging 5 doz. eggs @ 25¢.....	19
A garden.....	40

Total production..... 604

These estimates are borne out by actual studies. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics found that the typical two-mule Delta cotton farm producing cotton, corn, and a small

amount of livestock requires a total of only 2,300 man-hours of labor per year.¹ The amount of family labor actually available is 4,080 man-hours. Therefore, except during the 2 months of cotton picking, the family labor is less than half employed. A similar picture of under-employment could be given for small, low-income farmers in all other areas of the Nation.

Even with present inefficient time-consuming methods used on most low-income farms—lack of good tools, equipment, machinery, and modern practices—it can be demonstrated that a production of only \$1,000 worth of farm products sold, traded, or used at home means that the available family labor is idle part of the year. If some of the more efficient methods of production were used, then by no stretch of the imagination could a production of \$1,000 worth of farm products furnish full employment for a farm family.

How many bona fide farmers are there in the United States whose total farm production is worth less than \$1,000? Let us first determine the total number of bona fide farmers.

Obviously all the 6,096,799 farms listed in the 1940 Census are not bona fide farms. The figure includes many farms whose operators worked most of their time in nearby towns and cities or on other farms or were retired and living on their savings or aid from off-farm sources. In order to find the number of bona fide farmers whose farms furnish their major source of livelihood, we

deduct the following groups from the 6,096,799 figure: (1) The farms which were unclassified in the 1940 Census; (2) those families who reported no gross farm income at all; (3) those who worked off their farm a major part of the time, and (4) those who are retired but living in the country. There remain 4,794,727 bona fide farm operators. The computations are shown as follows:

Total farms reported in 1940	
Census.....	6, 096, 799
Deduct—	
(1) The unclassified farms.....	39, 542
(2) Those reporting no gross income.....	88, 502
(3) Those working off farm over 150 days.....	759, 903
(4) The retired operator ($\frac{1}{2}$ those over 65).....	414, 125
	<hr/> 1, 302, 072
Total bona-fide farmers.....	4, 794, 727

How many of these bona fide operators fall below the \$1,000 level of gross earned farm income? The Census shows 4,018,869 farmers reporting gross earned farm incomes below \$1,000 in 1939. If we assume that all of the groups listed above as not being bona fide farmers were included among the 4,018,869 farms below the \$1,000 level, we arrive at a figure of 2,716,797 bona fide low-income farmers in 1939.²

These 2,717,000 under-employed, low-income farmers constitute about 56 percent of the bona-fide farmers of the Nation.

² These computations differ only slightly from those made by Mr. Maddox. He started with 3,460,000 farmers under \$800 and deducted (1) 346,000 farmers to make allowance for improved conditions since 1939, (2) 560,000 farmers who worked off their farms over 200 days and (3) 360,000 retired operators. There remained 2,194,000 low-income farmers.

¹ An unpublished study by the Division of Farm Management and Costs, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, "Farm Resources and Farming Systems Needed to Meet Living Needs of Farm Families in Five Types of Farming Areas."

What different kinds of farmers make up the ranks of the farm under-employed? If we assume that all standard FSA rehabilitation borrowers and all sharecroppers fall into this group as well as half of the farmers working off their farms from 50 to 150 days a year (defined here as part-time farmers), the distribution would be about as follows:

	Number	Percent
Part-time farmers...	221,788	8
Sharecroppers.....	541,300	20
"Full time" farmers		
FSA standard bor-		
rowers	435,000	16
Others	1,518,799	56
Total low-income farm-		
ers	2,716,797	100

These under-employed farm families are distributed geographically as follows:

	Number	Percent
West	97,607	4
Great Plains.....	190,038	7
Midwest.....	474,520	17
Northeast.....	124,839	5
South.....	1,829,793	67
Total	2,716,797	100

When it is realized that more than half of the Nation's productive agricultural man-power is located on these 2,717,000 farms, and that

(1) the larger commercial farmers are already producing at capacity or near-capacity—by hiring labor, by already being more completely mechanized, and by already utilizing the most efficient methods;

(2) as farm labor becomes scarcer, these commercial farmers may actually decrease their output of farm products—it becomes immediately obvious that the resources of these under-employed farm families must be mobilized immediately if we are to produce the food necessary to win the war.

Production Potentialities

There is good evidence that these low-income farmers could produce a substantial part of the food production increases called for in the United States Department of Agriculture production goals as of January 16, 1942.

In the following paragraphs are presented briefly the results of an intensive study of production possibilities of low-income farmers. In this study specialists from the Farm Security Administration and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics collaborated in estimating how much these under-employed farmers could produce if they: (1) Got additional operating capital such as feed, seed, fertilizer, and limestone; (2) added some permanent capital such as sows, baby chicks, or heifer calves; (3) followed improved methods of production; (4) improved their health; and (5) obtained more stable tenure.

For the study the Nation was divided into four major regions and 17 types-of-farming areas. In each of these areas production estimates were developed for four categories of low-income farmers: "full-time" farmers, FSA and BAE specialists and Western irrigated and dry-farm operators.

Armed with factual data from farm management studies of low-income farmers. FSA and BAE specialists familiar with particular areas under consideration sat around a conference table and worked out answers to the following types of questions: (1) How many of the low-income farmers in this area could be reached and would respond to a Food for Freedom program; (2) of these, how many could buy a cow from a neighbor or one going to market and

what increased production could be expected from these cows; (3) how many farmers could buy a heifer or grow out one of their own and what production could be secured from this source; (4) what increased milk production could be expected on the typical low-income farm in this area from improved feeding, care and practices; (5) how many farmers could produce an extra litter of pigs; and what increased pork production could be secured from improved feeding, care, and vaccination; (6) how many farmers could increase acreages of the various crops adopted to the area and what production could be secured; (7) how much of the increased production for each of the items would be used for subsistence and how much would be available for sale; (8) how much money would be needed for loans for the purchase of livestock, workstock, feed, seed, lime and fertilizer, equipment and machinery repairs and general operating expenses?

Based on estimates as outlined above and assuming that the needed *increases* in food production will be as great in 1943 as in 1942, then in 1943 the Nation's 2,716,797 low-income farmers could produce:

48 percent of the needed milk increases.

58 percent of the pork and lard increases.

118 percent of the egg increases.

18 percent of the peanut increases.

10 percent of the soybean increases.

25 percent of the sugar beets increases.

69 percent of the tomatoes for canning increases.

145 percent of the garden increases.

Now it is perfectly clear that it is too late to do much about tapping this reservoir of man-power for the 1942 season—a comprehensive program just doesn't get underway that fast.

FSA officials have estimated, however, that with a thorough-going loan-and-supervision program beginning this spring and summer about 1,200,000 low-income farmers can be reached for 1943 food production. This would be in addition to the 435,000 families now on the FSA rehabilitation program, most of whom are already producing Food for Freedom on an extended scale.

The 1,200,000 potential producers that might be reached by a new program are constituted as follows: "full-time" farmers, 910,000; part-time farmers, 130,000; and sharecroppers, 160,000. Of this group, 81,000 are in the West, 562,000 in the South, 382,000 in the Midwest, and 175,000 in the Northeast.

The food contributions of these under-employed farmers are quite substantial. Of course, part of their increased production would be consumed on the farm, but three-fourths of the milk, pork, and lard, all of the soybeans, peanuts, sugar beets, and truck crops, and about 70 percent of the eggs would be available for sale as "Food for Freedom."

That this substantial food production is possible by low-income farmers—farmers who are now contributing little or nothing to the Nation's supply of vital foods—is indicated by actual records of low-income families in the Farm Security Administration's rural rehabilitation program.

The average FSA rehabilitation borrower has increased his gross

cash receipts by \$187 since coming into the program. Using 1936-40 prices, the average increase in gross cash receipts among these 1,200,000 potential food producing low-income farmers could be \$165 if they were aided in producing Food for Freedom. Moreover, while the average FSA borrower has increased the value of his home-use products by \$101, the expected increase for this other group would average \$70. It is apparent, then, that the above estimates of the food production by these low-income farmers are quite conservative and, we believe, definitely realistic.

Low-income farmers in the Midwest and the South have the greatest potentialities for food production increases of any areas of the Nation. The Midwest, particularly in the southern part and in the upper-lake area, has large numbers of under-employed farmers together with fair land resources, equipment and machinery, fair marketing and processing facilities and good transportation. The South has much greater labor surpluses, but fewer marketing and processing facilities and less productive land.

The Northeast has the advantage of excellent marketing facilities and can increase egg and milk production. The West, with fewer low-income farmers than other areas, can make substantial contribution in sugar beet, truck, and egg production, particularly in the Pacific area.

A Production Program

The causes of inadequate income and lack of employment are deep and complex. Consequently, a program to help these farmers produce Food for Freedom must be developed in

terms of the difficulties which the low-income farmer faces.

We believe that FSA experience has pointed the way to the development of a program that will not only hit at these causes effectively but also with the speed necessary for the production of badly-needed war foods. Such a program would not solve all the underlying problems of low-income farmers, to be sure, but it would remove the major barriers to immediate food production and make a start toward eliminating some of the adverse factors altogether.

1. Capital and Credit

The under-employed farmer lacks enough land, machinery, tools, equipment, livestock, fertilizer, and seed. Without a minimum of these capital items he is powerless to produce efficiently. As a result, his labor is wasted, he contributes little to the food supplies of the Nation and, worse yet, he is *poor*.

According to the 1940 Census, 3,578,000 farms (or approximately 3 out of 5) were under 100 acres in size. Even eliminating the retired farmers and those working most of their time off the farm, still about half of the bona fide farmers operate farms of this size. The typical farm plant among these farmers is small—about 40 or 50 acres of land, 20-25 acres of crops, \$250 worth of implements and machinery—a total plant valued at only about \$3,000 for land, buildings, implements, and machinery.

An indication of what the typical farmer in this group has is given by a BAE study of FSA borrowers. This study showed that about one-third of the farmers had no cows before coming on the FSA program,

43 percent had no hogs, 16 percent had no poultry, and 38 percent had no garden. Most of these FSA borrowers were active farmers when they applied for FSA loans, too. Lack of livestock and gardens, together with lack of implements, machinery, and cropland, made impossible the full employment of the farm family labor.

As a first prerequisite for utilizing their wasted labor for producing needed food, the Nation's under-employed farmers must be able to get credit suited to their needs. Ordinary short-term production credit will not do, even if it were made available to farmers whose only security is labor or earning power. These farmers need to build up working assets and they need a particular kind of credit for the purpose.

Food for Freedom loans to these farmers should be directed to: (1) Increase the acreage, and improve the efficiency of production, of the crops needed; (2) get livestock on farms needing it, such as gilts for breeding, baby chicks, cows headed for slaughter which are still fair producers and heifer calves which would otherwise be vealed; (3) pay operating costs during the production season in order for the farmer to hold his crops and livestock until ready for sale; (4) buy feed and seed; (5) buy fertilizer and limestone; (6) buy implement and machinery repairs; and (7) buy workstock.

Such a credit program would not involve large loans. In the production outlined earlier for the 1,200,000 low-income farmers to be reached before the 1943 season, the loan requirements would average less than \$300 per farm. This would require a total loan fund available for credit

for these farmers of about \$350,000,000.

To do the job, this credit program would have to be streamlined to the Nth degree, with red tape eliminated. Rates should be reasonable and service prompt. Every cent should be utilized for production.

Proper credit extended to these under-employed farmers now would continue to help them produce Food for Freedom for several years. Nearly half of the entire amount of these loans would go for capital goods which would continue to produce year in and year out.

At the same time, despite the fact that the lending of these funds would provide a production stimulus for several years to come, the returns from such loans would be immediate. It is estimated that the total value of the new war food produced by these 1,200,000 low-income farmers in 1943 would amount to \$390,000,000. This would guarantee a substantial repayment of these loan funds within a 2-year period—in addition to adding measurably to the Nation's supply of essential foods in 1943 and each year thereafter.

2. Supervision

Another reason for under-employment among these farmers is their lack of education and vocational training.

Studies show that half of all FSA borrowers, who are typical low-income people, have never gone beyond the 7th grade and average only a 4th grade education. In the South, two out of three borrowers have never completed more than the 7th grade. Without educational assistance and guidance, the great mass of low-income farmers cannot contrib-

ute fully to the Nation's food production program.

The low-income farm enterprise is often characterized by such "inefficiencies" as unbalanced livestock rations, lack of farm-grown protein crops (such as legume hays), failure to use limestone and fertilizer in seeding of legumes, poor planting methods, improper care of livestock, and unvaccinated livestock. A farmer's labor contributes little to the food production effort if he feeds his corn to wormy hogs in a mud puddle, or feeds timothy hay to milk cows when, with a little planning and some limestone, good quality legume hay could be grown.

Correction of these inefficiencies requires an intense "on the farm" educational program. Supervision for war food production should stress: (1) Home food production, (2) food preparation, (3) farm and home planning, (4) development of simple farm and home skills, and (5) improvement in farm practices.

In the critical seasons many of these families would need the benefits of a supervisory visit each month. Part of the supervision could be done through groups. In addition to the guidance of technically trained farm and home supervisors the help of successful local farmers in neighborhood supervisory activities should be enlisted.

3. Tenure Improvement

Another principal obstacle to full utilization of manpower is the low-income farmer's unstable relationship with the land.

Few people who have not actually farmed have a full realization of the effect of *uncertain* tenure on farm production. The psychological effect of not knowing if he can stay

on the farm another year, or of waiting until near moving date before leasing the farm, discourages a tenant from making the improvements in fences, hog houses, poultry houses, or watering facilities; storing the necessary feeds for carrying over livestock; making soil improvements such as liming and plowing under green manures; planning and carrying out a complete crop rotation; or planning crops which carry over into the succeeding year.

Misunderstanding between landlord and tenant often results in ineffective production. One may prevent the other from following more effective practices, such as increasing the acreage of certain crops, growing a garden, or keeping subsistence livestock for family living.

Hundreds of thousands of farmers disrupt their farming operations by moving from one farm to another. The 1940 Census showed that 998,300 farmers in that year were operating farms to which they moved during 1939 and the first three months of 1940.

Thus unstable tenure or improper lease provisions prevents great numbers of low-income farmers from accumulating necessary capital and planning their operations so as to make effective use of their labor.

Tenure arrangements must be improved if the low-income farmer is to produce Food for Freedom. Landlords and tenants should be encouraged to enter into written lease contracts for a term of at least 2 years and preferably 5 years, providing (1) specific designation of the war foods to be produced; (2) protection of the tenant's investment in improvements necessary for war food production; (3) space for garden and food storage; (4) automatic

renewal for at least the duration of the war emergency; and (5) specific designation of yield-increasing farm practices such as liming, seeding legumes, growing winter crops, etc.

Local war boards, the agricultural press, and agricultural workers should inform landlords and tenants of the importance of stable tenure in the war food program. Some agency such as FSA which has a staff of tenure specialists in the field should be charged with the responsibility for seeing that a tenure program is carried out on a large scale.

4. Cooperative Facilities

Many small farmers cannot overcome the problems of capital deficiencies even with loans because their small farm operations cannot support the individual purchase of operating goods and services.

Thousands of farmers all over the country have met this difficulty by going together and buying tools, equipment, livestock, and other goods, and maintaining necessary facilities cooperatively. Low-income farmers, however, have generally been unable to take advantage of cooperatives. Except for the several thousand participating in FSA cooperatives, there are relatively few low-income members of the Nation's cooperative enterprises. The reason is that they do not have enough cash to pay cooperative membership fees or to establish cooperatives of their own.

Cooperative devices must be developed where needed to help low-income farmers:

(1) Increase their production—through better livestock breeding and by purchases of better feed, seed, and fertilizer in bulk;

(2) Make better use of their re-

sources—by operating and repairing jointly owned machinery and equipment;

(3) Market their products efficiently—through jointly owned facilities, warehouses, and transportation services.

Loans should be made to enable farmers to establish and participate in local cooperative groups for production purposes. Part of the individual loans for capital goods and such operating items as livestock, feed, and seed should be spent by borrowers through cooperative groups. In this way the loan money can be spread further and with greater effect.

5. Health

Unused farm man-power is often ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed. The resulting poor health stands as a barrier to the full realization of the farm's productive possibilities.

Poor health among low-income farm people is widespread. In 21 typical counties in 17 states, thorough physical examinations were given in 1940 to FSA borrowers and their families—11,497 people. An average of more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ defects was found for every man, women, and child. Poor teeth was the most common defect. Teeth, physicians and dentists agree, are directly affected by diet. About one in every 10 children under 15 years of age was 16 percent or more underweight.

Most families had accumulated defects over the years, as a result of lack of medical and dental care. For instance, 54.2 percent of wives in white families were suffering from childbirth injuries; 8.5 percent of heads of families had hernias; 60.5 percent of all children had defective tonsils.

It is impossible for a sick farm family to do a good job of farm production. Provision must be made in the farm and home plans of every low-income war food producer for home production of enough good food to provide the entire family with an adequate diet. Provision must also be made for the improvement of sanitary facilities, screens, water supplies, bedding, and other farm and home items whose improvements makes for better health.

Disabilities such as hernia, bad teeth and tonsils, infected adenoids, and other physical handicaps must be removed if low-income farmers are to be strong enough for the war food production job under the proposed program. This means an expansion of all medical services in rural areas through group and co-operative medical care plans similar to those already developed by FSA.

The Long-Run Objective

No statement on the role of low-income farmers in the war effort is complete without considering what can be done to make more worthwhile the freedom these farmers are helping to defend.

Participating in the Food for Freedom program helps under-employed farmers feel that they have a part in the defense of their democracy. But that is not enough. These are the people without adequate opportunities for self-development, without adequate training for better jobs, without an adequate share of the Nation's education and resources. These are the people, making up a vast proportion of the Nation's farm population, to whom democracy has meant least among all groups in the country.

It has been pointed out that the

immediate objective of the proposed production program for low-income farm families is to produce vital war foods. That objective cannot be achieved alone by loans and supervision and the other techniques mentioned above, however. Beyond these means of assistance must be a powerful effort to open up for the Nation's low-income farm population a better way of life, a future, a new world of opportunities.

There must be developed vocational opportunities for the young people on the low-income farms, tomorrow's citizens who can find hope only through opportunity to develop their abilities and thus become self-reliant through the employment of their labor. There must be opportunities for good education in elementary and secondary schools, for training in special skills, for normal intellectual development.

There must be opened up to low-income farm people the opportunity to become an important part of the farm community, to close the gap that seems to stand between the disadvantaged and the more fortunate in agriculture. There must be the opportunity for neighborhood activities, for discussion groups, for community recreation, for free expression of religious convictions.

Only if these opportunities are opened up for the under-employed, low-income farm families of this Nation will producing Food for Freedom have the meaning that it might. The democracy that is being defended by these efforts is ultimately the democracy of the common man and woman whose individual welfare, whose status, whose place under the sun are and always have been the fundamental idea of our democratic way of life.

Crop Insurance Helps

FIGHT THE WAR

By LEROY K. SMITH. *Crop insurance makes three important contributions to agriculture's war-time drive for greater and greater production.*



THE CROP insurance program is one of several instruments that today aid farmers in their food for freedom production drive. Effectively supplementing the price support and adjustment features of the program, crop insurance on wheat and cotton makes three important and essential contributions to the Nation's all-out total war:

1. It rejuvenates and stiffens farmer morale.

2. It helps keep farmers on their farms working at their job of producing food for freedom.

3. It supplies a catalog of land and production values at a time when the Nation must make the greatest and most efficient use of its land without wasting the soil.

By insuring 50 percent or 75 percent of his average crop yield, the Department of Agriculture's program under the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation guarantees the insured wheat or cotton farmer an assured crop income. Insurance protection from all unavoidable hazards strengthens morale at a time when farmer morale is vitally important. A protected crop frees him from worry over possible want, burdensome debts, mortgages, taxes, and is a definite contribution to rural

health. A farmer who does not have to concern himself over the effect on himself and his family of possible crop failure and subsequent lack of income is much better able to do a more efficient job of farming and producing.

Crop insurance has helped and continues to help wheat and cotton growers to achieve self-maintenance as individuals and as a group. Through guaranteed yields the risk of needing relief assistance is lessened and the financial requirements of local, county, state, and Federal rehabilitation measures will be alleviated.

Thus, assured crop yields enable growers to avoid the perils of mortgage foreclosure and helps farmers stay on the land working with renewed confidence at their job of producing food for freedom. At a time like the present when American agriculture is asked to produce more of the commodities of which there is a surplus, insurance becomes increasingly important. The fewer acres of any given commodity a farmer plants the more essential it becomes for him to realize a crop income from those acres. Assured crop yields, by guaranteeing crop income on one commodity, serve to stimulate and encourage the produc-

tion of other vitally needed commodities for which there is a growing demand.

In this widening scope of land utilization, crop insurance serves another distinct purpose as a catalog of land values and productivity. With respect to the latter, the Corporation's actuarial data can indicate where best to concentrate greater production effort with the least possible risk when and if greater production of insurable commodities becomes immediately necessary. It is a guide for producing well and abundantly.

Since crop insurance is a form of protection for which farmers must pay premiums, its operation serves to siphon off some buying power, thereby helping avoid the dangers of inflation.

These wartime benefits of crop insurance have been made possible by the successful reception accorded the program when it first was carried to wheat growers of the Nation in 1938. Successful application of its principles in the wheat country was the forerunner of extension of the program to cotton in 1942. Both wheat and cotton programs are based on the same principles. Growers may insure either 50 percent or 75 percent of their average yield. For this protection they pay a premium based on the crop loss record of their individual farms during past years. Production and crop loss for each county is used in determining the yield and rate for each farm. As production and crop loss history become available through actual operation of the program, this datum is woven into the actuarial structure after a lapse of one year.

Premiums are paid by means of a commodity note, which is a part of

the application for insurance. Since all insurance contracts now are for a 3-year period, the annual installment for each crop year is payable in either the actual commodity or the cash equivalent on or before the day the note installment is due each year. If the installment is not paid by the due date, the insured grower allows the Corporation to deduct the amount of the premium installment from his indemnity, if any; from the first Government payment due him for cooperating in the National Farm Program; or from the proceeds of any commodity loan he obtains under any loan program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Indemnities are paid by means of a certificate of indemnity. The certificate can be converted into cash by returning it to the Corporation or the indemnified farmer can use it to obtain a commodity loan if loans are available. If loans are available, they may be obtained with this certificate either from the Commodity Credit Corporation or from private lending agencies.

Both landlords and tenants can insure their interest in a cotton or wheat crop, one requirement being that they insure all the wheat or cotton crops in the same county in which they have an interest. About half a million wheat farms will be insured under the Corporation's 1942 program. A goal of half a million also has been set for the 1942 cotton program, the first year in which insurance has been applied to cotton.

The Corporation is continuing its research on insurance with respect to other crops; namely, corn, tobacco, rice, citrus fruits, and forests.

Post-War Agriculture

IN THE HIGH PLAINS

By KARL S. LANDSTROM. *Effects of the war on the Texas-Oklahoma High Plains, and adjustments considered necessary after the war are told in this article.*



THE ATTENTION of the entire Nation was focused on the agricultural problems of the High Plains and adjacent areas that arose in the depression, drought, and dust-storm years, 1933-38. In these years there was abandonment of thousands of acres of land, impoverishment of farmers and townspeople alike, and wholesale emigration from the more severely eroded areas. The last few years have been a period of reconstruction, in which the people, aided by Federal, State, and local governments, have attempted to establish an agriculture more nearly in line with the capabilities of the available land, water, and range resources for sustained productive use.

Farmers and ranchers in the High Plains now are facing wartime problems. To aid in winning the war they are helping to produce increased quantities of essential foods, and are assisting the Department of Agriculture in developing plans for further expansion of production in 1943. They also are thinking about the prospects for agriculture in the Plains after the war, and are wondering what should be done to safeguard against irreparable damage to nat-

ural resources in the war period and to prevent insofar as possible a recurrence of maladjustments similar to those that arose after World War I.

At the request of the National Resources Planning Board, to aid in its studies of resource development and stabilization of employment, a field interbureau committee of the Department of Agriculture recently prepared a description of the physical, economic, and human characteristics of the High Plains in Texas and Oklahoma. They then analyzed these characteristics in terms of adjustments needed in the long run if agriculture in the Plains is continuously to provide a satisfactory mode of life. The conclusions of the committee have current significance for farmers and agricultural workers in planning for wartime production adjustments and in looking forward to adjustments after the war.

The High Plains in Texas and Oklahoma is a physiographically defined area bordered on the east by the "caprock" escarpment, and on the south by the Trans-Pecos and Edwards Plateau areas. The plains in Texas and Oklahoma comprise an area of about 30,000 square miles, with a 1940 population of about

300,000 people. The area is subdivided into a "North Plains" and "South Plains" by the Canadian River Breaks, an intrenched valley and bordering rolling grazing land along the Canadian River in the northern Texas panhandle.

The plains slope smoothly south-eastward from an elevation of about 4,000 feet at a rate of 15 feet per mile, and are dissected at wide intervals by shallow intermittent drainageways. Much of the internal drainage is into playa lakes, which are the principal source of recharge for the ground-water reservoir. The soils vary widely in depth, texture, structure, and erodibility, but generally are fertile and only slightly leached. According to estimates of the Soil Conservation Service, about half of the land is suited to cultivation under conservation practices ranging from simple to complex. Most of the other half is suited to livestock grazing under varying use restrictions. Only 45 percent of the land is under dry-land or irrigated cultivation, but this cropland includes some land classed as not suitable for cultivation. Wind erosion has been severe on much of the cultivated land, and on less of the range land. The climate is characterized by limited precipitation of irregular seasonal distribution, low humidity, high evaporation, high spring winds, hot summer days and cool nights, and open winters. The mean annual precipitation ranges from 13 to 23 inches, with wide year-to-year and seasonal variation.

The Underground Reservoir

Dry-land farming on the heavy and moderately sandy soils, and livestock grazing on the sands, sand hills, shallow soils, and rough,

broken areas are the predominant rural land uses except in petroleum and natural gas fields. The predominant dry-land crops are wheat, sorghums, and cotton. Pump irrigation from widespread ground-water resources is increasing rapidly in several localities in the South Plains, but there has been some lowering of water elevations because of excessive concentration of pumping operations. Over 200,000 acres of wheat, sorghums, cotton, and other crops were irrigated in the South Plains in 1939. The underground reservoir is also tapped by wells for domestic and stock-water purposes, but in many areas is not at present being utilized to the fullest extent consistent with conservation. Increase in irrigation development within the area would provide an opportunity for resettlement of families who eventually must abandon undersized crop farms or cropland unsuited for continuous cultivation.

The transplanting to this area at the time of settlement of an ill-adapted land-tenure system based on experiences with family-size farms in earlier settled, more humid areas farther east has resulted in abandonment or multiple operation of small tracts, a high degree of nonresident ownership, and a large proportion of tenancy. This, together with overdependence on one-crop systems of dry-land wheat or cotton production in an area of exceptionally erratic climate, has resulted in instability of farm occupancy and income. The relatively sparse population has fluctuated widely in reaction to variations in climate and in economic factors like prices, credit, and government crop adjustment policies. Farm employment is unstable and rural living facilities for laborers are

Grass

Grass is the forgiveness of Nature—her constant benediction. Fields trampled with battle, saturated with blood, torn with the ruts of cannon, grow green again with grass, and carnage is forgotten. Streets abandoned by traffic become grass-grown, like rural lanes, and are obliterated. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish, but grass is immortal. Beleaguered by the sullen hosts of winter it withdraws into the impregnable fortress of its subterranean vitality and emerges upon the solicitation of spring. Sown by the winds, by wandering birds, propagated by the subtle horticulture of the elements which are its ministers and servants, it softens the rude outline of the world.

—JOHN JAMES INGALLS

inadequate. Farm income under prevalent systems of farming is highly unstable, leading to a high level of public assistance in unfavorable periods. The tenancy situation and the nature of landlord-tenant

relations are important obstacles in this area to as full intensification of farming systems as might be possible within the limits of the available resources and the capabilities of the farmers.

To point the way toward the solution of these and related problems, the committee outlined an over-all program of long-range agricultural development. This statement of objectives, or amendments of it as may be developed from time to time, forms a basis for selection of wartime production plans that are calculated to assist in, or to conflict least with, desirable long-time adjustments. It also forms a basis for initial selection of rural public works projects for the post-war period. The over-all adjustments suggested by the committee include the following points:

1. Redistribution of the people in agricultural areas according to the capacity of the land, water, and range resources to support them and permit them to maintain an adequate level of public services and facilities.
2. Retirement from cultivation of all land now cultivated that is seriously eroded or is unsuited for continuous cultivation, and reclamation of such land for range, wildlife, or recreational uses. Readjustment where necessary of land uses and land management practices so as to place them in line with land adaptabilities and limitations.
3. Further agricultural development of land that can support additional population, including extension of irrigation wherever practicable through further development and conservation of surface and ground water.
4. Stabilization of farming and ranching on a sounder basis and development of greater intensity of

resource use consistent with conservation, (a) by adopting and carrying out carefully prepared farm management plans, and (b) by increasing amounts of land and water resources available to farmers who at present have access to resources that are inadequate to provide satisfactory incomes.

5. Elimination of excessive absentee ownership and reduction of farm tenancy by assisting tenants to become owners. Improvement of landlord-tenant relations through legislation and education.

6. Reduction of land-tax delinquency by classifying tax-reverted land in accordance with its capabilities for continuous use, retaining such land for public purposes, or otherwise bringing use into line with use capability.

7. Continuation and extension of carefully chosen land, water, and range conservation practices. Restoration of maximum carrying capacity under proper management of all permanent pasture and range land. Widespread use of rural zoning, land-use regulation by soil conservation districts, and other public or group devices to obtain desirable land-use adjustments.

8. Increased emphasis where feasible on local processing and manufacturing of agricultural products, to provide greater opportunity to rural people for nearby nonfarm employment.

9. Further improvement of rural

public educational and health organizations and facilities for all the people, and development of other public services in keeping with desirable intensity of settlement. Establishment of at least a minimum level of rural housing.

10. Fuller utilization of recreational opportunities through public construction and management of necessary facilities. Adequate developmental and conservational facilities for wildlife, including expansion and farm wildlife enterprises for home food and supplemental income.

In developing its statement of long-range adjustments, the committee recognized the need of strengthened and better correlated lines of investigation and research to form a more comprehensive framework of reference for agricultural planning at the area level in the High Plains. Much of the needed information will become available from research and planning conducted at other levels (State, watershed, production-adjustment area, county, etc.) or along subject-matter lines without regard to area boundaries. Needed particularly is development of more comprehensive long-range policies for agriculture in the Nation as a whole and in the region of which the High Plains is a part. The existence of widely accepted specific policies at national and regional levels is a condition precedent to full development of agricultural policies in States and local areas.

In the present world crisis, dollars have value only as we convert them into goods which are the lifeblood of our national strength.

—HENRY A. WALLACE

A Local War Program ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR

By A COMMITTEE. *What factors are involved in handling farm labor problems locally? This is what was recommended by one group of specialists in the Southwest.*



FARM LABORERS have been a surplus group for nearly 10 years. They have been made to feel that they were unnecessary, a burden to society, and, in too many instances, unwanted. Some counties have prevented their free passage across the county boundaries. They have been driven out of towns and their make-shift homes have been burned by armed vigilantes.

Many groups enticed to their communities three and four times as many workers as could be used, and then forced wages below those promised to entice them into the community. One banker-farmer summed up the attitude behind such actions when he said: "I need three crews. One that I just fired, one that is working for me, and one that is coming to take the place of these when I fire them."

Then came the war. Today, agriculture suddenly finds that the labor supply which seemed inexhaustible is rapidly diminishing. Whether we like it or not, we must recognize the following facts about farm labor and adjust our thinking accordingly:

Large numbers of agricultural workers have been drawn into industrial or military activities. As

the national war effort is stepped up, still more workers will be drawn from agriculture.

Industry is enticing agricultural workers by offering higher wages and shorter hours. Men who were paid \$1 or \$2 per day for farm work during the thirties are now drawing a minimum of \$5 per day in industry.

At this time, industry promises more stability than agriculture. Many agricultural workers are given work only at peak seasons. In order to have steady employment, they must travel from place to place, following the harvest, at the sacrifice of a stable home life and educational advantages for their children.

Industrial workers enjoy many special advantages denied agricultural workers including workmen's compensation and social security.

Industrial workers on the whole have better housing, more sanitary conditions, and better medical facilities than agricultural workers.

A stable family life, education for the young, good housing, sanitation, adequate medical facilities and insurance against disability, sickness, and unemployment make for national strength. Without them, conditions are ideal for the development of disease and political discontent.

A nation in which such conditions are general is ill prepared to meet an enemy.

Any plan designed to provide sufficient farm labor to win the war and write the peace must recognize these facts. It must also recognize that total war demands an end to "agriculture as usual." The unlimited production of the less essential agricultural products would be just as unwise and unpatriotic as the production of automobiles at the expense of tanks and bombers. The production goals of the Department of Agriculture are agriculture's priority list. Consequently, we may expect machinery and labor to be rationed to farmers on the basis of the position of their product on the priority list. A straw indicating the direction of the wind is a memorandum dated December 4, 1941, from the National Headquarters of the Selective Service Board to State Directors for local board release. The subject: "Necessary men engaged in agricultural activities."

Kinds of Produce

Designed to provide local selective service boards with basic information for deferring selectees, this memorandum divides agricultural produce into two divisions: (1) Commodities of great importance, under which are included milk and dairy products, eggs and egg products, poultry meat products, and hogs and lard products; and (2) commodities of distinct importance, including naval stores (turpentine and resinous products), flax and hemp, soybeans, peanuts, sugar beets, sugarcane, commercial vegetables, cattle and calves, and sheep and lambs. It further points out that "The areas in which the greatest difficulties in

securing labor have been experienced during 1941 correspond roughly with the areas in which a major portion of the agricultural products listed above must be produced."

In the section devoted to Policy and Procedure, the memorandum states: "The local board has the problem of deciding whether or not an individual agricultural worker is so necessary to so much of the agricultural program which is in the interest of national defense, that he should be deferred under the provisions of paragraphs 350-353 of the regulations. This problem should be approached with a full appreciation of the considerations described above i. e.: (a) Importance of the product; (b) importance of the enterprise; (c) importance of the skill; (d) relative labor shortage in the area."

The one-crop farms operated on a large scale generally contribute the products least needed for either war or peace and require the most seasonal labor. While they contribute little to defense, they tend to bring about instability of farm labor; prevent the agricultural ladder from working; and, by competition with products produced cheaply in terms of money, but costly in terms of national welfare, drive the family-type farmer from the land.

Granted these facts, the following constitute a "must" list of things to be done in order to bring the security of farm labor on a parity with that for industrial workers:

1. Extend the workmen's compensation and social security acts to include farm labor. As family-type farm operators are also workers, they, too, should be included under the acts. In order to encourage the stability which develops the most de-

Free

The essence of our struggle today is that man shall be free. There can be no real freedom for the common man without enlightened social policies. In the last analysis, they are the stakes for which democracies are today fighting.

—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

sirable citizens, it is necessary to have as high a percentage of resident labor as possible. It is the stable resident, with an interest in the local community, that makes the good citizen. It is the stable resident that can establish a home and instill in his children those qualities necessary to build the America of the future.

2. Provide full employment for farm labor. This may be accomplished in two ways. The first is to organize farm activities in such a way as to employ year-round labor and require a minimum of seasonal labor. Fortunately, many of the foods and crops needed to win the war and maintain a healthy nation in peacetimes are those which demand the least seasonal employment. Many farmers can further diversify and thus provide full-time employment. The second method is to plan nonagricultural work to be carried on during slack seasons of agriculture. In every county, there is road construction and maintenance

and other public works, as well as private construction. If such work is so timed as to be carried on during slack agricultural periods, it will stabilize employment and income for resident workers and at the same time retain local labor which is best for farmers and the community.

3. Keep the agricultural ladder free. The best possible workers are those who have hopes and ambitions to become farmers and farm owners. The person who feels that he has no opportunity to advance will be less likely to be a good worker or citizen.

4. Provide adequate housing for farm labor. Unmarried men will not accept farm labor unless they are provided with room and board comparable to what they can get in industrial work. Married men cannot be expected to remain farm laborers unless their families can be provided with adequate housing. Farmers needing year-round help should provide adequate and convenient housing on the farm. A federally subsidized housing program for building permanent labor homes in communities where year-around laborers are needed has long been a vital need in rural communities. During the present emergency, the need is even more vital. The more laborers that can be provided suitable housing near their work, the less will be the need for rubber tires and automobiles to carry them back and forth.

5. Obtain parity wages for agricultural workers. Unless agricultural workers receive wages on a parity with industry, they will take positions with industry. It will work to the welfare of the small farmer, as well as the laborer and community to insist upon the enactment of a minimum wage standard for agricultural workers. As a mat-

ter of self-protection, farmers should insist that certain minimum labor conditions be met in order to permit payments under AAA, or in order to obtain marketing quotas under AAA.

6. Provide adequate medical facilities to farm labor families. Many industries offer free medical services to their employees. Agriculture can offset that disadvantage in bargaining for labor by insisting that FSA provide grants for full medical needs of farm labor families.

7. Limit hours of work. In addition to high wages, industry offers workers shorter working hours. It is generally conceded that an industrial worker will do nearly as much in 8 hours as in 12. Farmers are beginning to recognize this fact. In 1941 a number reported that they had limited the hours of work to 8 and that their workers were accomplishing just as much or more than under the old 10- or 12-hour system.

8. Train farm labor. It is frequently pointed out that much farm labor is of a skilled nature and that the shortage of that kind of labor is most acute. It will become more and more necessary for farmers to train their labor. Industry is bidding for unskilled workers whom they then train for their jobs. Agriculture must do the same.

9. Produce farm products that are high on the priority list. This will enable farmers to anticipate that their requests for labor to the Employment Service office may be filled according to the rating of the product for which they need workers. If their product is listed in the second grouping, their order may not be filled until all needs for the harvest of the more vital groups are filled.

10. Encourage the family-type

farm. The farm labor shortage can be met best by family-type farms organized to require the minimum of seasonal labor and operating on a diversified agricultural plan. These are the farms which can best step up the production of the most vital foods.

Make 'Em Feel Important

All of which add up to one big commandment: *Develop a feeling that farm workers are important to agriculture, the community, and the Nation.* The best, and, therefore, cheapest workers are those who are contented, which means those who feel that they are vital to their country's welfare. Such an attitude can be developed by providing full employment and the feeling of security that goes with it. This means good physical and mental health through adequate housing, sanitation, nutrition, and medical facilities. It means fair treatment of employees by employers, and a square deal for their families, too.

The points outlined above present the essentials of a program to retain farm labor, win the war, and develop good citizens. But objectives and the machinery to translate them into action are two different things. A county organization is needed to cope with the problems outlined above—an organization that begins with the United States Employment Service and the USDA War Boards established in every agricultural county. In order to provide county USDA War Boards with the machinery necessary to fulfill their responsibilities in the labor field and also in order that labor problems shall be tied in with over-all agricultural planning for the counties, it is recommended that the following

organization be set up to function as a joint subcommittee of the war board and the county agricultural planning committee:

The Farm Security Administration supervisor, after consulting with local agricultural people interested in the labor problems and the welfare of laborers, shall appoint, with the approval of the district supervisor, a county War Farm Labor Committee consisting of representatives of the FSA, USES, WPA, two USDA agencies (one to represent the defense board and one to represent the planning committee), two farmers, and two farm laborers.

It is felt that in any county where the labor problem is sufficient to necessitate in-migration of labor it is essential that a USES employee should be available full-time, or at least during the peak seasons.

Practical plans will be needed if such War Farm Labor Committees are to click. Planning is the first requirement for the retention and mobilization of labor resources. And facts are absolutely essential to intelligent planning.

There are two main sets of facts which must be obtained on the county level. Set number one consists of *accurate data on the number of laborers needed at specific times*. This is essential because there is not a large surplus of farm labor available, and a miscalculation by one community or enterprise may deprive another of labor necessary to save its crop. Unless labor is used economically, there will not be enough to go around. We must husband our labor resources and use them as efficiently as we do our rubber and aluminum. They are just as vital to our defense. Time must not be lost in going to a job that does

not exist. If workers do not have full employment and, by going to jobs that do not exist, get the impression that there is not enough farm work, they will accept positions in industry.

To determine the laborers needed at specific times, a step-by-step method is suggested. From AAA or other records, obtain data on the acreage of each crop which requires seasonal labor, and the number of farmers raising the crop. Then draw up a table showing the man-days required for each operation at the time of year when it occurs and the duration of the season. Next, determine the number of acres which an individual worker can handle during the season. Divide the total number of acres by the acres that can be handled by one man. From the above result, subtract the number of operators raising the crop plus the number of family workers and year-round hired men employed by the operators who raise that crop. The result will be the number of seasonal workers required.

Sometimes There Are Enough

In many counties, the above calculation may show that there are sufficient farm operators to harvest the entire crop even though additional seasonal workers have been employed in the past. This is especially true in the wheat area. The reasons for the apparent error are that some of the farmers are large operators who have hired farm laborers. Other operators may have other businesses and depend on hiring cheap farm labor from a glutted labor market. At the same time that seasonal laborers were employed by these two groups, a large number of smaller and low-income operators

have been underemployed even at peak seasons.

Under these conditions, unless there is an abundance of unemployed resident workers, those who have acreages too large to be operated by their own family and full-time employees should seek assistance from their neighbors with smaller acreages. Such cooperative arrangements would be worked out best in advance of the season. The arrangement should not be difficult, as farmers recognize the national need for the crops. Neither is it too much to expect each operator to contribute his own labor, as his operations prevent the use of his land by farm families who could do the work. Indeed, the welfare of the American farmer is undermined by the non-resident operator who competes with cheap seasonal labor and thus tends to push down the farmer's level of living, force him off the land, and eventually reduce him to the status of a migratory laborer. And while it is probable that the small farmer may demand a higher wage to work off his own farm, he will undoubtedly be worth more. Full utilization of skilled agriculturalists is as vital to defense as full utilization of skilled machinists. Such a cooperative arrangement will also increase the full utilization of machinery.

The second set of facts needed at the county level concern the *number of laborers available at a specific time*. In case there are not enough farm resident workers, attention should be turned next to the other resident labor supply of the county. Its efficient utilization also depends upon planning based on the knowledge of facts. The following recommendations are made for obtain-

Strongest

The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindreds.

—ABRAHAM LINCOLN

ing the necessary information on a county basis:

1. A general survey should be made of the available resident labor supply by months. This should be done by months because during some seasons there will be more workers available than at others. For instance, during the summer there will be a number of boys out of school who will be available.

2. In advance of the season when additional workers will be needed, workers should be urged to register with the local Employment Service office or an office designated to cooperate with it. This necessary registration of available workers will be facilitated if the Social Security Act is extended to include farm labor.

3. Also in advance of the season, farmers who need workers should register their needs with the same office. In addition to their needs, they should indicate a definite period of time for which they will hire the men, and the extent of the job they have in terms of acres or other unit of work. Any valid prediction

as to labor demand and any reliable opinion regarding adequacy of labor supply must be based on known acreage, known crop conditions, and scientific crop estimates. The size of the job should be compared with the number of men requested, in order to bring the two into agreement. This precaution is necessary, for being used to a surplus labor supply in the past, we have employed large numbers for a short period to do a job that now would be more desirable to extend over a longer period with fewer men.

The committee should determine the length of time over which the various processes may be carried on. This is necessary since the records of the Employment Service are full of requests for workers which far exceed the needs. A typical case is taken from the records of the Texas State Employment Service: "An order for 500 pickers was received at 8 a. m. By noon, 150 pickers were on the job and by 8 a. m. the next morning the entire order was filled by the local employment office. Not only the labor need was exaggerated but the actual acreage was inflated. According to publicity, 500 acres were ready for harvest; actually, the acreage was 150. The 500 workers had 12 to 15 hours of employment. Fifty workers might have had a week of work." And this was in an area requesting that immigrant workers from Mexico be brought in!

In case it is determined that there are not enough resident workers to accomplish the work to be done at a given season, the Committee should request the nearest United States Employment Service at once to locate and direct the necessary workers into the area at the time they will be

needed. From that point on, the USES, in cooperation with the United States Farm Placement Service, will plan for meeting the indicated needs. Before requesting the in-migration of farm workers, committees should have signed orders for the total number of workers requested. Each order should be signed by the farmer making the request. The order should further indicate how many acres to be worked and what the rate of pay will be and what the plans are for housing and transporting the workers. The USES office will not act on any unsigned order. Each county committee will be provided with a supply of order forms. No orders for migratory workers will be acted upon as long as there is sufficient available local labor. And any effort on the part of individuals or groups toward creating a surplus of labor at any point should be immediately discouraged.

Best Use of Migratory Labor

Although the Employment Service will plan to import workers into the county, it is up to the War Farm Loan Committee itself to prepare for best use of such migratory labor.

For one thing, War Farm Labor Committees must take steps necessary to improve already existing housing and construct housing where it is needed. Where individual farmers cannot finance such housing as is needed, committees should insist on the establishment of permanent and seasonal housing for farm workers through community assistance or through governmental aid. Some committees are already planning cooperatively to purchase and remodel tourist camps to be

rented at low prices to migratory laborers. The Farm Security Administration already has set up a program to provide housing for migratory laborers in well-organized temporary or semipermanent communities with sanitary facilities, medical care, and recreational leadership.

With the migration of the youngest and most efficient workers to the cities, farmers will have to rely more and more on the group least able—physically—to labor. Until farm laborers are accorded the same consideration as city workers under social legislation and until farm prices will permit wages to agricultural laborers that will enable them to afford medical care, a federally subsidized program should be provided immediately to finance medical care for farm workers and their families, including corrective surgical and dental cases.

It is reasonable to forecast that if our farmers do actually require labor other than that available within the immediate and nearby communities, there will be a transportation problem. Whereas, in previous years, most migratory farm labor transported themselves by motor vehicles requiring such commodities as oil, gasoline, and tires, we now know that even motor vehicles themselves, as well as fuel, lubricants, and tires will be most difficult, if not entirely impossible, for this group of people to obtain. Farm labor committees should investigate the most efficient means of transporting workers into an area and the most efficient means of moving them from home to work, once they are there. School busses can be pressed into service along systematically-planned routes to carry

workers from their houses to work.

Farm labor committees must make an effort to afford farm wages and hours more nearly comparable to industrial wages and hours. In order that such provisions might be uniformly fair to all farmers, observance of minimum wages and maximum hours standards should be a prerequisite to obtaining benefit payments. Assurances should also be made that farm income is supported at a level that will permit farmers to meet those standards.

In the field of social security, accident compensation has long been available to industrial workers under *State Workmen's Compensation Insurance* laws. Steps should be taken immediately to secure the same coverage on a Federal basis, for both *farm operator and labor*. Unemployment insurance for farm labor must be made available immediately. There is no justification for discrimination against farm groups on this law. And Old Age Insurance coverage of farm workers should be enacted as soon as possible—including a guarantee of a *minimum* monthly payment after the age of 60, adequate to provide a minimum standard of living considered decent.

Until adequate social security legislation is provided for farm workers, a cooperative arrangement between Surplus Marketing Administration and Farm Security Administration should be made for making grants to enable farm workers to purchase orange stamps and receive an additional 50 percent of blue stamps during periods of unemployment due to weather conditions, physical disability, or lack of employment opportunity.

State Agricultural LEGISLATION, 1942

By ARTHUR B. JEBENS. *A review of what State legislatures have done thus far in 1942 in agricultural enactments, and of some of the principal proposals now pending.*



MOST LEGISLATIVE sessions for this year ended by March. Only a few States, according to available information, have considered major land use and rural welfare legislation, except as necessitated by the impact of war conditions. At the same time, practically no effort was made to develop new sources of revenue or to increase existing tax rates. As a matter of fact, the Governor of the State of New York has recommended an \$8,000,000 budget slash.

Additional expenditures for defense councils conversion unemployment, police and fire protection, and similar items have been more than counterbalanced by decreased relief expenditures and curtailments in capital outlays and large scale highway construction programs.

Two States, New York and New Jersey, are considering post-war planning. The New York Legislature has before it a bill that would create a temporary commission to investigate the possibility of full utilization of men and machines at the termination of hostilities. In New Jersey, one proposal would enable counties and cities to create public works reserves, and other bills would

create State agencies to protect peacetime industries and to plan against economic depressions in future years.

In Michigan there has been a suggestion to place the responsibility for subdivision control in the State Planning Commission. Checking all subdivision plots by the State health, highway, and education departments and the county roads commission for adequate provision for water supply, drainage, sanitation, recreation, and education would be required before the Planning Commission could give its final approval.

In Virginia, a regional planning commission is being considered for the counties surrounding Richmond to control land subdivision and building construction. County zoning enabling acts are before the Kentucky and South Carolina legislatures. In Mississippi, New Jersey, and Virginia, bills have been introduced that would provide for the zoning of airport approaches.

Increased attention is being given to supplying adequate housing, education, and roads in rural areas. Kentucky and Virginia are considering enabling legislation for regional housing authorities to undertake housing projects for farmers of

low incomes. Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia are considering legislation that would transfer some or all of the maintenance and construction costs of county farm-to-market roads to the State, and they would transfer also to the State the financial responsibility for transporting rural school children.

Conservation

The possibility of supplying free text books for children in the public schools is before the legislatures of these same States. In Virginia, the auditor indicates that the present cost of the text books to the students is \$1,254,000. Under a rental system, it would be \$1,114,000 and under a system of free distribution the estimated cost would be \$603,000.

The Virginia Forest and Forest Land Problems Interim Commission made its report to the legislature but recommended only a few modest changes. The addenda to the report prepared by the State Forester contains an excellent discussion of the State's forest resources. The only bill introduced in this connection would extend the pine seed tree law to all counties in the State. A senate resolution has been introduced to continue and expand the functions of the commission.

In New York the reforestation appropriation has been given a tentative cut of \$100,000. Minimum requirements for timber cutting and naval stores have been proposed in Mississippi. In Kentucky and Virginia bills have been introduced to permit the State to recover fire-fighting costs from any person who negligently starts a fire that spreads to forest land. A number of bills have been introduced in Mississippi to

provide for the administration of school and other public lands and to promote cooperation between the owners of surface and subsurface rights. An appropriation for a survey of surface and ground waters has been approved in the house.

A number of New York bills deal with flood-control projects in that State. Among the appropriations are items for \$17,500 to continue the work of the commission in studying State participation in the Federal long-range program of flood control and \$230,000 for State participation in Federal projects. Other proposals would authorize the Public Works Superintendent to acquire property in stream-beds, lakes, highways, or right-of-ways for flood-control purposes.

Taxation

The problem of taxing all real and personal property at full value is being considered in South Carolina. Mississippi and Kentucky would permit county supervisors to accept payments in lieu of taxes from the TVA. In an effort to aid New York assessors to determine land values, every real property conveyance offered for recording would be required to contain a recital of the true consideration paid unless a verification of the amount paid was made available to the assessor, tax commission, or representatives of the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue. The distribution of motor fuel taxes is being debated in New York and Mississippi.

Tax collection and the administration of tax delinquent land seems to be under consideration in practically every legislature now meeting. One major bill would change the functions of the Mississippi tax collector

to that of back-tax collector. Other Mississippi bills would adopt a statute of limitations to prevent attacks on State tax titles after a certain period and provide for the distribution of the proceeds from the sale of tax-delinquent lands.

Miscellaneous

A bill to require all farm organizations to file a list of their membership by counties with the secretary of State has been introduced in Mississippi. In New Jersey, New York, and Kentucky there is a possibility that legislation restricting the hours of labor for children and women may be amended. This is particularly necessary in areas where shortages in farm labor have developed.

Adoption of daylight saving time by the United States Congress has created a number of problems in States. In New York, the attorney general ruled that this change would not apply to the State judicial system, farmers, and intrastate businesses. Legislation has been enacted in New York and several other States to correct this condition.

A few bills have been introduced in the field of agricultural marketing. In New Jersey and Virginia, the milk control bill would be repealed, whereas in New York cities

would be authorized to enter the field of milk distribution. South Carolina has before it bills requiring the addition of vitamin A to oleo-margarine, enrichment of flour, and regulation of the sale of eggs. The bill creating a commission of growers and shippers of fruits and vegetables has been introduced in Mississippi. This commission would recommend marketing regulations to the Commissioner of Agriculture.

A plan for Congressional reapportionment has been adopted by the Pennsylvania Special Session and new bills on reapportionment of the State legislatures have been introduced in New York and Virginia.

The calendar for 1942 state legislative sessions is as follows:

Regular

Kentucky.....	Jan. 6	Mar. 3
Louisiana.....	May 11	
Mississippi.....	Jan. 6	
New Jersey.....	Jan. 13	
New York.....	Jan. 7	
Rhode Island.....	Jan. 6	
South Carolina.....	Jan. 13	Mar. 14
Virginia.....	Jan. 14	Mar. 14

Special

California (1).....	Dec. 19	Jan. 22
California (2).....	Jan. 17	Jan. 18
Illinois.....	Dec. 18	Jan. 15
Maine.....	Jan. 12	Jan. 24
Massachusetts.....	Jan. 26	Jan. 31
Michigan (1).....	Jan. 19	Jan. 27
Michigan (2).....	Feb. 9	Feb. 27
Pennsylvania.....	Feb. 17	

The mind needs to come into tender relations with the earth and treat that most intimate of all spots with something akin to piety, since a personal pressure is diffused through every part of it, and divinity there awaits to meet us always.

—BRONSON ALCOTT.

Rural Community Mobilization In the War Effort

by DOUGLAS ENSMINGER

THE PROMPTNESS and completeness of the response of rural people to the Nation's total war effort depends in large measure on the effectiveness of rural organization on the face-to-face level of the neighborhood and community. Our democratic way of life is best exemplified within these local groups where ideas and opinions are freely expressed and consensus more readily reached with respect to war situations, problems, and plans for action.

Defense councils and War Boards need wholehearted support and assistance of all the people. They will require a vast amount of information which only local people can give. Smoothly functioning local organizations under accepted leadership, permit the quick, full mobilization of neighborhood and community groups to consider problems, assemble and discuss pertinent facts, set up goals or objectives, and develop plans for united action.

There is much to be said in favor of permitting local communities to do these jobs. When individuals participate as groups in formulating policies the group assumes specific responsibilities for getting something done about the problem.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD and community approach furnishes the basis, and establishes appropriate organizational channels for carrying to the people all the problems of

the defense council and the various programs operating in the county. This is the one certain method of assuring maximum coordination of all efforts regardless of their nature. It permits the harnessing of maximum resources to solve the problems at hand.

The group approach not only taps an invaluable source of aid in emergency, but through the interchange of ideas it broadens the individual's perspective and increases his knowledge and understanding of a situation, and to that degree improves morale.

Misinformation, gossip, and fear travel through the "grapevines" of human contacts. By mobilizing neighborhood and community groups we can assist local people, working through their community groups, to think straight, get the desired facts to formulate well-founded judgments, turn gossip into education, and convert fear into faith and confidence.

WHILE PLANNING is needed now, it will be needed even more in the post-war emergency. To plan for this period we need to begin now, working with and through the local groups of people (communities) who will be called upon to make the inevitable adjustments, 2, 5, and 10 years hence. These groups must fully understand what is happening today, and be able to formulate their

policies for the immediate present in order to be qualified to adapt their thinking and attitudes as the total situation and world order change.

The neighborhood and the community are the seedbeds of our democracy. It is within these local areas that people will and do voluntarily work together in school and church affairs, and meet in groups to "neighbor" with each other, dis-

cussing their common problems both local and national. Through their group efforts they can and will, if given the opportunity, work out ways and means of utilizing the resources of the group. Should we in the present emergency neglect to utilize the potential strength of soundly organized rural communities we shall have deprived ourselves of our greatest bulwark in the preservation of democratic processes.

Limits of Economic Research In Planning

by DAVID L. MACFARLANE

MOST ECONOMISTS agree that Carlyle's descriptions of the universe of the economist as an "immeasurable swine's trough" and the principles of economics as Pig Philosophy are valid—even though not a particularly attractive way of putting it. The soundness of these propositions rests in the fact that economics deals with the allocation of scarce resources according to a criterion of the rational pursuit of profit. That the economist accepts maximization of financial return as a datum in any problem necessarily leads to his pleading guilty to the charges made by Carlyle.

This, however, implies neither that our modern economy is unduly materialistic and soulless, nor that the economist is a capitalist apologist. In fact, he cannot, in his professional role, be an apologist for anything. Within that role he must be a scientist, and carry on according to a distinct body of methodology which

is in no way influenced by his particular views on socialism, cooperation, capitalism, free education, religion, or homeopathy.

He has perfect right to personal views on all of these subjects, but they have no relevance to his practice of the profession of the economist. While economics is a very challenging study, these limitations on its scope may make it appear very prosaic.

THIS PORTRAYAL of economics requires heeding carefully these two statements by Lionel Robbins:

(1) "Economics is not concerned with ends as such," and (2) "The economist who thinks that his subject is capable of being used as a basis for policy without further appeal to social philosophy is cherishing a naive delusion." Each of Robbins' two rules respecting economics holds important implications for economic studies in land-use planning. The

scientific procedures used in economics impose on the economist limitations which are suggested in Robbins' first statement.

That these are not always observed by professional workers in agricultural economics is sufficient justification for this reminder. In other words, there is sometimes a failure to recognize that economics is a horse that can carry one only to certain destinations—always short of the goal of setting up public policies. Some economists working in land-use planning have in their studies over-ridden the goals to which economics could possibly bear them. The result is that in these cases they have dismounted on shaky ground.

The contribution of the economist in any particular investigation is, after gaining a knowledge of the setting of the problem and available data relating to it, to analyze these by deductive, inductive and statistical procedures. This permits him to state that certain hypotheses relating to the problem are or are not valid. The equilibrium method is the most fruitful one the economist has, and its only significance "for realistic price theory is that it offers a basis for prediction of the direction of change when an equilibrium is not established."

THE ECONOMIST'S contribution (as an economist) to social policy is to state that under assumed conditions an economy will move toward an equilibrium he is able to describe. The assumptions may or may not relate to the real world and to real facts. (The economists' chief concern is that they are tractable.) By selecting assumptions which may not relate to real facts the economist can test schemes recommended by

some groups. For instance, competent economists in Great Britain, and even in Alberta, carried out analyses respecting the distribution of resources and returns under a Social Credit system. The results of the analyses were discouraging, but the people of Alberta went ahead with the first steps of such a system and found to their dissatisfaction that the findings of the economists were valid, even for a dynamic world.

The people of Alberta were quite within their rights in attempting to secure a Social Credit scheme, even in the face of the conclusions stated by the economists. The economists did all they should have done. To have engaged in political agitation (even against Social Credit) on that occasion would surely have placed the economist in a position where his future usefulness in the community would have been greatly reduced. Further, he faced the difficulty that he is not generally as well equipped to carry an issue to the public as is the politician.

In the planning function the economist can make invaluable analyses. He can state that under the conditions set up in his analyses certain tendencies may be expected. Here his job ends. Others then have the needed basis for social philosophizing. The economist says an economy *tends* in a certain direction. The social philosopher, the politician, the educator, the press, say that an economy *should tend* in a certain direction.

I may, as a reader, agree with everything in the very challenging article, The Anti-Industrial Revolution (Harpers, December 1941), but as an economist I am not influenced. I might make studies of the distribution of incomes and the levels of

consumption in the society described in that article, but whatever my findings I would not, as an economist, recommend moving toward such a goal. Yet my economic findings might make such a goal appear very attractive. Only, however, after the noneconomic aspects of striving for these goals have been studied (and I cannot make these studies) should the implications of the Anti-Industrial Revolution be dismissed or adopted as a national policy.

Carrying on the productive life of a country can be represented as a game—and one which has well defined rules (mainly the legal framework). Whether by static or dynamic procedures, the best the economist can do (and remain an economist) is to examine problems of the economy, and to state his findings as tendencies which could be expected if the conditions involved in the assumptions were realized. He cannot, as an economist, recommend

or work for changes in the rules of the game. In a democratic society these must come after the relevant social philosophizing. If the results of the economist show legal or administrative changes to be clearly desirable, he must await an understanding public opinion to effect the changes.

This matter of changing the rules of the game is particularly pertinent in questions of post-war planning. Considerable change in rules may be required to effect a shift of war plants to peacetime needs. The economist, at the appropriate time, must proceed to examine the volume of production and distribution of the product on the basis of a variety of sets of assumptions which might hold in a post-war world. His results can then experience appeal to the next higher court—their examination under the light of other than economic considerations.

We are all shoulder to shoulder, marching along behind our armed forces who are out in front, taking the raps and the dangers for 21 bucks a month. We want them as well fed, as well clothed, and as well protected by the best arms, as is humanly possible. Likewise, we on the home front want not riches, but health and security, and strength to win the war and build the peace that will remove the causes of war, by giving an opportunity for health and security to all people.

Now, let's consider what happens

if we overshoot. If we do that, my friends, we have nothing to fear. There will be food for workers, laborers, soldiers, and the people of the United Nations. And we need waste no time in alarm over what a bumper crop, surpassing the goals by many millions of bushels and pounds, will mean to us as farmers. For let me say again, this is not 1914-18. It is 1942, and we have learned our lesson of how to both produce and distribute.

—ROY F. HENDRICKSON.

Changes in the Plains

by GORDON MURRAY

BETWEEN 1930 and 1940, major readjustments took place in the agriculture of the Great Plains. After years of unproductive effort, many farmers growing crops unsuited to the climate of the region on farms that were too small, gave up the struggle and left. Between 1930 and 1940 the rural population declined 12.5 percent, and the number of farms decreased even more rapidly. More than 14 percent of the farms existing in 1930 had disappeared by 1940. Many of them were absorbed into others, and the fewer farms became larger farms. The average farm was 123.7 acres larger in 1940 than in 1930. Apparently the increase was at the expense of medium-sized farms, because small farms increased by about one-third and large farms (1,000 acres or more) increased by 17.1 percent.

In 1930, almost one-third of the farmers in the Plains, 31.5 percent, owned, at least nominally, all of the land they operated. Many had mortgaged their land, but they held title to it and enjoyed most of the rights which go with ownership. In 1940 only 28.2 percent of the farms in the Great Plains were operated by full owners. In the United States, during the same period, farms operated by full owners increased from 56.7 to 60.7 percent of all farms.

The full-owner farms were also smaller in average size, contrary to a trend toward larger farms which has been observed generally in the Great Plains. In 1930 the average owner-operated farm was 400.1

acres, but by 1940 it was only 385.8 acres. In an area where the great need is for larger farms, the reduction in size of owner-operated farms probably meant that owners were less secure, less able to support themselves and their families in 1940 than they had been in 1930.

There were fewer part owners as well as fewer owners in the Great Plains in 1940 than there had been in 1930, though the decrease in the number of part owners was not so great as the decrease in the number of owners. Still the reduction in the number of part owners in the Plains was at a rate more than two and one-half times as great as in the United States generally.

UNLIKE full owners, part owners increased considerably the size of their farms. During the decade the average part owner added 338.6 acres to his farm. In part, this added acreage represents nothing more than a transfer of open range, used free and not counted as part of the farm in 1930, to farm land, controlled by leasing and counted as part of the farm in 1940. Also, to some extent, it represents a shift of operators of large farms, who were formerly full owners, to the part-owner group. There was, however, a real gain: The acreage to which the average part owner held title increased from 512.7 acres in 1935 to 624.1 acres in 1940, that is to say, by 21.7 percent.

Undoubtedly part owners were better prepared to earn a living in 1940

than they had been in 1930, and insofar as more part owners means larger farms, the Great Plains benefited by this change. Undoubtedly the complex pattern of land ownership in the Great Plains makes renting the only present means by which many farmers can control farm units of adequate size.

In 1940 there were fewer tenant farms in the Great Plains than there had been in 1930, just as there were fewer tenant farms in the Nation as a whole, but the decrease was only half as great in the Plains (5.8 percent) as in the United States (11.4 percent). Unfortunately, we cannot conclude that because there are fewer tenant farms now than formerly, tenancy was less a problem in the Great Plains in 1940 than in 1930.

DESPITE the reduction in tenant farms, forces at work in the Great Plains tended to make tenants, rather than owners or part owners, out of Great Plains farmers. Land operated by tenants increased from 27.5 percent of all farm land in 1930 to 28.7 percent in 1940, and the proportion of farms operated by tenants rose from 41.3 to 45.5 percent during the 10-year period.

So far as the size of their farms is concerned, tenants who survived the other changes were better off than they had been in 1930. Like part owners, they enlarged their scale of operations during the decade. On the average, they operated 61.8 acres more in 1940 than they had in 1930.



Books

BIBLE PLANTS FOR AMERICAN GARDENS. *Eleanor A. King*. The Macmillan Co. New York. 203 pages.

by WILBUR H. YOUNGMAN

THE GROWING of plants native to the Bible lands intrigues a great many gardeners and is the major emphasis which Miss King gives to her book. However, there are other, and to me more important thoughts to be gained from this well written and interesting book.

The general description of the topography and climatic conditions of the Holy Land as it relates to the plant and economic life is most interesting. "For 6 months the land

had rain, for 6 months it suffered from drought, during the rainy season the whole land was green and the desert blossomed as the rose." The fact that the hills were steep and were terraced and planted to vineyards does much to explain why wine-growing and wine-making occupied a rather prominent part in the lives of the people of that time. Today we know that the finest wines come from similar areas both in this country and in Europe.

Miss King gives us a very excellent description of the meaning of many names used in the Bible. Corn, as in England is the name applied to wheat, tares refers to tarnel grass—a poisonous plant greatly resembling the wheat plant. "Barley and wheat were the two staple cereal crops of both Palestine and Egypt, and were the most important of all crops referred to as corn. Barley, the less expensive, was widely used by the poor for bread. Mentioned many times in the Bible, barley makes its first appearance as an Egyptian crop which was 'in the ear' when the plague of hail smote the land of the Nile destroying this valuable food (Exo. 9:31)."

Thus many of us should get a great deal more meaning and a better understanding of the people as given in the Bible from reading this book. The people of those days were close to the land—hence the stories and parables are in terms of those things which were most familiar to them. The use of the word rose connotes roses to us, but it is pointed out that it probably referred to the wild narcissus of the Holy Land or to the anemones. Later it is pointed out that there are several species of roses native to that country, but that it is very doubtful if they were referred to in the language of the Bible.

SOME OF THE details given in this book are most amazing and emphasizes the scope of the studies. The importance of the overflowing streams upon the productivity of the lands; the methods of cutting timber during the building of King Solomon's Temple is questioned, and uses made of several plants are described. Perhaps the Israelites did

not employ a modern method of logging in those days but even so they did not destroy the forests of Lebanon.

We think of soil conservation as a comparatively modern development of agriculture but it is carefully pointed out that the people of the land in those far-off days sought to save the soil.

Not only did they terrace the hills, but every seventh year was a "Sabbath year" and the land was allowed to rest. Land tenure was a major influence in that period and the description given is of interest. "Laws of land tenure were carefully designed to keep the people mindful that God was the source of their blessings. The land belonged to God, and His people were guests and sojourners upon His land. 'The land shall not be sold forever,' were the words of the Lord, 'for the land is mine' (Lev. 25:23). Therefore, all land reverted to its original owners every fiftieth year, called the Year of Jubilee, and when land was bought or sold it was with the Year of Jubilee in mind, for the price varied with the number of years to Jubilee. In this fiftieth year, 'ye shall return every man into his possession * * * ye shall not therefore oppress one another; but thou shalt fear thy God' (Lev. 25:10,17)." Land tenure and land conservation thus influenced the activities and customs of the people.

BESIDES describing the many plants that were native to the Holy Land, Miss King pointed out that even in those early days there had been a certain amount of plant spread or migration along the trade routes. Since such introductions

cannot be dated certain interpretations must be made. The myrrh, frankincense, and incenses used at that time probably were importations, although they could have been derived from native or introduced plants. The former is believed to be the case in spite of the fact that the costs must have been great.

Bible Plants for American Gar-

dens thus can be of interest to the general reader, to the historian, and to the gardener. Many home gardeners will find the brief discussions of the plants described, together with cultural directions, of help in their own gardening activities. The use of several kinds of plants indoors, as house plants, is mentioned, giving the book wider application.

IMPERFECT COMPETITION WITHIN AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES. *William H. Nicholls.* Iowa State College Press. 384 pages.

by ARTHUR O. SHAPIRO

THIS BOOK is a comprehensive and erudite attempt to unite economic theory and practice. The author has adapted and extended existing theory to application in a new field—agricultural processing and distribution.

The problems of imperfect competition and the short-run dynamics in agriculture (e. g., the cobweb problem) are handled skillfully with all the tools of analysis.

The author leans heavily on Triffin, Chamberlin, Robinson, Marshall, and Viner, and includes references from the works of Stigler, Hart, Leontief, and many others. He describes the competitive status of many agricultural industries, such as butter, livestock, milk, and tobacco. While confining equilibrium analysis to groups of firms, the author constantly compares the individual firm with the industry as a whole. There are many special tables, outlines, and conclusions that summarize the problems developed.

While industries are cited as practical examples, it does not follow, however, that they would all

prove to be upon empirical analysis exactly as illustrated. The book is technical. It is full of curves, tables, symbolism, and formulas.

THE MARKET channel for butter includes the farmer, the local creamery, the large-scale wholesale distributor, the retailer, and the consumer. Here are four closely related markets. The author discusses, however, the market between the local creamery and the large-scale wholesale distributor and the market between the latter and the retailer. The former market is imperfectly competitive because of locational factors, although the creamery may sell under conditions of pure competition. This market is, thus, that of near-oligopsony or even monopsony. The market between the distributor and the retailer, however, may be one in which both buying and selling are under imperfect competition. This is one of oligopoly and oligopsony.

"Live and let live" replaces price competition among the dominant firms. The uncertainties are partly

eliminated by various market conventions (market sharing). These firms are nonaggressive in their buying and selling policies. They take the volume of goods which remains after the small firms have taken what they want at the price established by the most efficient of the dominant firms. While agricultural processor-distributors do not directly control the supply of the farm product, it does not mean that serious monopoly elements do not exist.

The following are suggestions for

conducting a study of price and production policies of any industry:

1. Description of the condition of the market, e. g., economic geography, empirical supply curves, etc.

2. Description of the policies of the individual firm, e. g., sharing the market, price leadership, etc.

3. Determination of the results of these policies, e. g., compare size of firm with sales turn-over, margin of profit, etc.

4. Alternative means of improvement in these results, e. g., Is reform necessary?, Government competition, etc.



Letters

SIR:

The article in the January 1942 issue of *Land Policy Review* by Charles B. Howe contributes to a better understanding of the term "limited-grazing." It is believed that this term has been rather carelessly used in the past. Limited (conservative) grazing, as established by reliable carrying capacity estimates, is a desirable goal. Pastures stocked within grazing capacity are designed to furnish ample forage at all times except, perhaps, during a severe drought year. It is expected that at the end of a severe drought year, the grass will be grazed rather closely. Under such conditions overutilization for the year may occur before the operator can adjust livestock numbers or obtain additional feed.

Results of range studies show that the grass stand thins out in the season following a drought year. This decrease in density automatically occurs and becomes

critical when pernicious over-grazing every year is the rule. Where a conservative grazing policy has been adhered to, excessive depletion of the stand following drought conditions does not occur.

The possibility of livestock operators not being in compliance with a limited grazing program should occur in only exceptionally poor forage years. It is during such periods that stockmen would especially appreciate financial assistance from conservation payments, which it seems they should receive if livestock numbers in previous years were conscientiously held within recommended carrying capacity. Probably the only check on compliance (throughout the years) that would be needed for operators who are stocked on the basis of range survey estimates, would be yearly check on numbers and slight adjustments made as needed, to make previous estimates more accurate.

Where livestock numbers are held at an intensive stocking rate in an attempt to completely utilize all available forage each year, the determination of compliance would be of major importance every year. Operators following such an intensive policy may be providing an opportunity for a serious depletion of grass cover on their pastures during drought years. There would exist also the probability of such operators misjudging the productive capacity of their units which would result in their not meeting the requirements of limited grazing.

An acceptable standard for determining proper range conservation on a broad scale may have important applications. In the northern Great Plains, particularly, counties in the range area are becoming large land owners, often owning 50 percent or more of the land. Authorities charged with the administration of these grazing lands are attempting to develop methods whereby forage productivity will be maintained and equitable fees for the use of this grass will

be received. The present system of leasing county lands, in most cases, does not consider the productive capabilities of the various types of land nor is a satisfactory method of controlling and determining degree of grazing in use.

Livestock operators generally are willing to pay a fee for the use of grass, if this fee is based on the amount of forage produced and a long-time tenure is provided. County administrators desire to secure a sustained source of income, which will be provided by the maintenance of high forage yield on their grazing lands. A practical method of initiating such a grazing program is needed. Provisions for obtaining a sustained forage yield and a workable method of determining for extensive acreages when the proper degree of grazing has been reached are pertinent problems.

—ARTHUR L. HOLDING,
*Soil Conservation Service,
Dodge City, Kansas.*



For Your Attention

EVERYBODY AND DEFENSE. University of Virginia Extension. v. 19, no. 6, December 1941. University, Va. 10 pages.

This small publication is made up of a partial list of free and inexpensive pamphlets, including discussion aids and reading lists, relating to defense and democracy. The items are briefly annotated and a topical index is included.

SHOULD FARMERS EMPHASIZE WHEAT OR LIVESTOCK IN NORTH CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA? Aaron G. Nelson

LAND POLICY REVIEW, APRIL 1942

and Gerald E. Korzan. South Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station Circular 33. Brookings, S. Dak., 1941. 16 pages.

The study of which this circular is the result "was made in an attempt to give information on the relative monetary advantages of producing wheat or livestock as the main enterprise on farms in North Central South Dakota." Farm records made from 1932 to 1939 furnished the basis for the study. From these records the authors conclude: (1) That the production of wheat and livestock probably will be about equally profitable on farms in this part of South Dakota where operators are able to obtain

"average" yields of wheat, providing the price of wheat is relatively high compared with that of feed grains, as it has been in the past; (2) the production of wheat probably would be materially reduced if wheat prices and production were not supported by governmental policies and programs; and (3) that the capital investment on the livestock farms is greater than on the wheat farms and if operators are to be able to shift to the production of livestock more credit may be required.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE AGRICULTURE OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS. Everett E. Edwards and Wayne D. Rasmussen. United States Department of Agriculture. Miscellaneous Publication No. 447. Washington, D. C., 1942. 107 pages.

This bibliography will be of interest to several groups of readers. In the introduction the authors stress the debt owed to the Indians for their domestication of economic plants, and the general reader will find useful the references relating to the pre-Columbian agriculture of the American Indian. The research worker who wishes to know about the methods used by the Indians in terrace farming, irrigation, conservation, and other evidences of progress beyond primitive cultivation will consult the section on the centers of advanced agricultural development. The scientist will find helpful the section that includes references to the particular crops domesticated and raised by the Indians. Those interested in present-day problems of irrigation, conservation, forestry, and land use will refer to the section on the agriculture of the Indian reservations.

The bibliography is well classified and annotated and is "comprehensive insofar as practicable."

AFTER THREE YEARS: A RE-STUDY OF THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT OF A GROUP OF DROUGHT MIGRANTS. Paul H. Landis. Washington Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 407, 36 pages. Pullman. 1941. (Studies in Rural Population No. 7.)

The study of which this bulletin is the

result carries a step farther one made 3 years earlier of a group of 381 drought migrants in northern Spokane, Franklin, Kitsap, and Lewis Counties, Wash. Results of the original study were published in Washington Experiment Station Bulletin 378, "The Farmer Adjusts to the West," by Richard Wakefield and Paul H. Landis, issued in 1939.

Of the original 227 families from the drought-depressed Great Plains, 129, or 27 percent were found to be still living in the respective areas. The authors found no absolute criteria by which the success or failure of the social and economic adjustment of these drought migrants might be measured, and their conclusions are given as tentative evaluations, largely in terms of preconceived standards.

In arriving at these evaluations certain comparisons as to net worth, property ownership, receipt of public assistance, and general factors involved show that adjustment had taken place to some degree.

The present outlook for these settlers is discussed.

EARLY AMERICAN SOIL CONSERVATIONISTS. Angus McDonald. U. S. Department of Agriculture. Miscellaneous Publication 449. 63 pages. Washington, D. C.

By 1750, in the older settled regions of the United States, on the sandy hillsides of New England and in the Southern and Middle Atlantic States, fields were becoming barren, farms had already been abandoned, and erosion was becoming generally noticed.

The folly of exploiting the land was realized by a few early conservationists, who, believing that ignorance was one of the causes of soil erosion, recommended the formation of agricultural societies and organizations and a wider dissemination of books, pamphlets, and farm journals.

This small publication is significant chiefly because it calls attention, in very readable fashion, to the fact that more than a century ago, these men attempted to arouse farmers to the dangers of erosion in this country and correctly analyzed its social, economic, and physical causes.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING: A PROGRAM FOR POST-WAR.
Guy Greer and Alvin H. Hansen.
Washington, D. C. National Planning Association. 1941. 24 pages.
(Planning Pamphlets No. 10.)

This pamphlet, which is described in the prefatory note as "primarily for purposes of exploration," points out the urgent need for extensive replanning and rebuilding of American towns and cities. In doing this, the authors state, "Federal and State financial and legal aid will be required."

The Federal program advocated would include:

"(a) Planning by local communities with Federal and State aid; then acquisition by local governments of land in slum and blighted areas as the first step toward redevelopment. Federal legislation for financial aid to be passed at once, to induce necessary State legislation and preparation of plans; large-scale rebuilding to start after end of war emergency.

"(b) Housing program, integrated with the above:

"(1) Rationalization of the entire process of production and subsequent utilization of housing, to lower the cost to the occupant. Research and experimental agency to be established at once.

"(2) Continuance of Federal aids (FHA, FHLB System, etc.) to home-ownership and special stimulation of the production, by private enterprise, of housing for rent to families of moderate-to-low income.

"(3) Re-examination and revival of public housing program."

BRITAIN'S TRADE IN THE POST-WAR WORLD. Washington, D. C. National Planning Association. 35 pages. (Planning Pamphlets No. 9.)

"This pamphlet is being published in the belief that the drastic change in Britain's trade position, unless fully understood, may prove to be a disastrous obstacle to the joint constructive efforts which will be imperative when the war has ceased. This is not merely because Britain, acting alone, might feel bound to resort to nationalistic trade practices; it is also because the American people might fall back thoughtlessly on policies of trade and investment

that would jeopardize the entire effort for world reconstruction.

"This pamphlet is intended solely to suggest the general character which the problem is likely to assume, and to point out the direction in which a possible solution may be found. Affected as it must be by the changing circumstances of war, the problem can admit of no full treatment or solution at the present time."

The first half of the booklet is devoted to a discussion of the revolution in Britain's economic position, describing British foreign assets, British foreign trade, services, balance of payments and the sterling area's supply of dollars.

In the second half, Britain's post-war trade problem is examined and six possible solutions are listed and discussed:

"A. Lend-Lease in perpetuity; B. Large-scale emigration from the British Isles; C. Return to the gold standard; D. The adoption of fluctuating exchanges; E. Bilateralism and exchange control; F. International economic collaboration for production and trade on a new and higher level."

Of these the first four are disposed of in summary fashion.

THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF BORON DEFICIENCY. C. G. Atwater. Reprint from Journal of the American Society of Agronomy. v. 33, no. 10, October 1941. Pages 939-942.

This brief article cites references to literature to show that the deficiency diseases of certain crops and especially those caused by a lack of boron are not "new" but have been recognized and written about for some years. "What is 'new'," the author says, "is the recognition of the meaning of deficiency symptoms and what is possible in the way of soil and crop treatment.

"The fallacy, it seems, lies in assuming that the exhaustion of the minor element supply in the soil was or is due to the recent change in the fertilizer materials in common use, merely on the ground that this change happened sometime before the remedy for the deficiencies was discovered . . ."

Among the deficiency diseases listed are corky spot of apples, black-heart disease of turnips, heart rot of sugar beets, cracked-stem disease of celery, and brown rot of cauliflower.

The glory of the farmer is that, in the division of labors, it is his part to create. All trade rests at least on his primitive activity. He stands close to nature; he obtains from the earth the bread and the meat. The food which was not, he causes to be. The first farmer was the first man, and all historic nobility rests on possession and use of land.

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON

